

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to because of an informality therein.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to change "files" in line 8 to --file--, as the Examiner has noted. Thus, the objection to claim 1 is now moot.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohler, U.S. Patent No. 6,591,188, and claims 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohler in view of LeFebvre et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,659,476. However, with regard to the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), Applicant notes that the Examiner has not addressed claims 2, and 4-6 in detail, and appears to acknowledge that Ohler does not disclose the subject matter of these claims.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 4 have been amended to more clearly define a feature of the invention and to more clearly distinguish over the applied prior art references by further defining the driving path log file including the driving path that the driver has driven through and then *selectively stored*. Applicant submits that no new matter is introduced by the present amendment. In this regard, the

Examiner's attention is directed to, inter alia, the disclosure of Fig. 2 and page 5, line 25 through page 6, line 1 of the present application.

It is a feature of an embodiment to provide a method of making a driving path log file library for searching a car navigation path that allows a driver to choose an optimal path.

To achieve the above-noted feature, a method of making a driving path log file library for searching a car navigation path of the present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, includes, inter alia, operating a car navigation system and deciding whether or not to store a driving path of a driver, when the driver decides to store the driving path, making a driving path log file with the driving path of the driver, storing the driving path log file, and making a driving path log file library out of the stored driving path log file. Further, the driving path log file includes the driving path that the driver has driven through and then selectively stored, and the driving path log file library includes a plurality of the stored driving path log files.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references relied upon in the rejections under 35U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a), considered singly or in any proper combination, do not disclose such a combination of features.

In particular, in the present embodiment, the driving path that the driver has driven through is *selectively stored* by the driver's decision (Steps 13 and 14 as shown in Fig. 2). In other words, in the present embodiment if the driver does not want to store the driving path log file, the driving path log file is not stored (page 5, line 25 through page 6, line 1). This combination of presently claimed

features is not disclosed in the applied references.

In comparison, in Ohler, although the “learning mode” can be manually activated, once the “learning mode” is activated, the trip information is then recorded and stored as a routine trip rout (Column 4, lines 15-21). In other words, after the “learning mode” is activated in the system of Ohler, trip information is automatically stored, and thus there is not *selective storage*, as disclosed and claimed in the present application. Applicant further submits that the disclosure of LeFebvre does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in the teachings of Ohler.

Thus, Ohler does not anticipate the presently claimed embodiment or render the presently claimed embodiment unpatentable, and thus the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) is improper. Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that the teachings of Ohler and LeFebvre can be properly combined, the asserted combination of Ohler and LeFebvre would not result in the invention as recited in dependent claims 2 and 4-6. Thus, the rejection of claims 2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is also improper.

Independent claims 1 and 4 are now in condition for allowance in view of the amendments and the above-noted remarks. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance in view of their dependence from the allowable base claims and also at least based upon their recitations of additional features of the present invention. It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn and that an early indication of the allowance thereof be given.


Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto.

Applicant recognizes that there is no right to entry of the above identified amendment. Nevertheless, Applicant notes that the above amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance, does not require further consideration or search, and does not introduce any prohibited new matter. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendment and provide an early indication of allowance of the application.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Seung-Bin PARK


Bruce H. Bernstein Daniel B. Moon
Reg. No. 29,027 Reg. No. 48,214

October 16, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191